



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,377	03/09/2004	George C. Schedivy	8002A-91	1599
22150	7590	11/28/2011		
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			EXAMINER ANYIKIRE, CHIKAODILI E	
			ART UNIT 2482	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/28/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@chauiplaw.com  
uspto1@chauiplaw.com  
garramone@chauiplaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/796,377	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHEDIVY, GEORGE C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2482	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,10-28,58 and 59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,10-28,58 and 59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 07, 2011 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-28, and 58-59 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield et al (US 2002/0003571) in view of Tiedemann (US 6,748,615).

As per **claim 1**, a video display device, comprising:

a housing including a front wall, a back wall, a top side, a bottom side, a left side and right side, wherein the front and back walls area connected to each other by the top bottom, left and right sides, and wherein the top, bottom, left and right sides extend directly from respective top, bottom, left, and right edges of the back wall (Figure 12, 37, 39A; paragraphs [00246], [0273] lines 36-46);

a screen (Figure 37 element 14032) positioned on the housing (paragraph [0313] lines 1-5); and

at least one strap connected to the housing for mounting the video display device to a visor of a vehicle (paragraphs [00246], [0273] lines 36-46; Schofield teaches incorporating the visor with the display).

However, Schofield does not explicitly teach wherein the at least one strap passes through a groove being formed by the front wall and the back wall of the housing, wherein the front wall includes the screen, and the top and bottom sides include respective holes therein for receiving the at least one strap there through, and wherein a portion of the at least one strap between opposing ends of the strap is located in an interior portion of the video display device in the groove between the front

and wall back walls and the opposing ends of the at least one strap extend out of the groove through the respective holes formed in the top and bottom sides of the video display device to an exterior portion of the video display device.

In the same field of endeavor, Tiedemann discloses wherein the at least one strap passes through a groove being formed by the front wall and the back wall of the housing, wherein the front wall includes the screen, and the top and bottom sides include respective holes therein for receiving the at least one strap there through, and wherein a portion of the at least one strap between opposing ends of the strap is located in an interior portion of the video display device in the groove between the front and wall back walls and the opposing ends of the at least one strap extend out of the groove through the respective holes formed in the top and bottom sides of the video display device to an exterior portion of the video display device (Figures 3 and 4 elements 40-43; column 2 lines 40-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Schofield in view of Tiedemann. The advantage is a simple, efficient, and practical slidable securing arrangement.

As per **claim 6**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one strap (Fig 12, 1212 and 1212') is secured to a wall of the video display device (paragraph [0273] Ln 36-46).

As per **claim 10**, Schofield discloses the video display device as recited in claim 1.

However, Schofield does not explicitly teach wherein the opposing ends are capable of being fastened together to form a closed loop.

In the same field of endeavor, Tiedemann discloses wherein the opposing ends are capable of being fastened together to form a closed loop (column 2 lines 29-35).

As per **claim 11**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1.

However, Schofield et al does not explicitly teach wherein a length of the at least one strap is adjustable.

In the same field of endeavor, Tiedemann discloses wherein a length of the at least one strap is adjustable (column 2 lines 29-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Schofield et al with Tiedemann. It is advantageous because the video display can be easily seen by an individual passenger (Col 5 Ln 29-31).

As per **claim 12**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, wherein the video display device (Fig 37, 14032) is one of a liquid crystal display device, an organic electro-luminescent display device, a cathode-ray tube device and a gas plasma device (paragraph [0313] Ln 8-17).

As per **claim 13**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, further comprising a navigation system, wherein the video display device displays navigation information from the navigation system on the screen (paragraph [0304]).

As per **claim 14**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, wherein the video display device is coupled to a navigation system and displays navigation information from the navigation system on the screen (paragraph [0304]).

As per **claim 15**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, wherein the video display device is coupled to a media player for displaying a video program from the media player (paragraph [0402]).

As per **claim 16**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 15, wherein the video display device displays the video program only when the vehicle is stationary (paragraph [0319]).

As per **claim 17**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 15, wherein the video display device displays the video program only when a parking brake of the vehicle is engaged (paragraph [0316]).

As per **claim 18**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 15, further comprising a device port, wherein the media player is coupled to the video display device through the device port (paragraph [0402]).

As per **claim 19**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 15, wherein the media player is one of a portable media player or a media player mounted in the vehicle (paragraph [0402]).

As per **claim 20**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, further comprising a device port, wherein a navigation device is coupled to the video display device through the device port (paragraph [0402]).

As per **claim 21**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 1, further comprising a connector for connecting the video display device to a wiring harness of the vehicle (paragraph [0309]).

As per **claim 22**, Schofield et al disclose the video display device as recited in claim 21, wherein the video display device is coupled to at least one of a vehicle navigation system, a vehicle media player, a vehicle power supply and a parking brake indicator signal via the connector and the wiring harness ([0304] and [0304]).

Regarding **claim 23**, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 13 and 14 are applicable for claim 23.

Regarding **claim 24**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable for claim 24.

Regarding **claim 25**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 12 are applicable for claim 25.

Regarding **claim 26**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 16 are applicable for claim 26.

Regarding **claim 27**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 17 are applicable for claim 27.

As per **claim 28**, Schofield discloses the video display device as recited in claim 23, wherein the video display device receives at least one of the vehicle navigation information and the video entertainment program from at least one external device electrically connected to the video display device (paragraph [0304] and [0309]).



As per **claim 58**, Schofield discloses the video display device as recited in claim 1.

However, Schofield does not explicitly teach wherein the groove includes as its border at least one edge extending perpendicular to and connected between the front and back walls.

In the same field of endeavor, Tiedemann teaches wherein the groove includes as its border at least one edge extending perpendicular to and connected between the front and back walls (Figure 4; column 2 lines 30 - 45).

Regarding **claim 59**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 58 are applicable for claim 59.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272 - 7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/796,377  
Art Unit: 2482

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHRISTOPHER S KELLEY/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2482

/Chikaodili E Anyikire/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2482